

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this response to the non-final Office Action dated January 6, 2009, claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 18 are amended. Support for the amendments is found, for example, at page 12, lines 10 to page 13, line 12; page 14, lines 8 to page 15, line 1 of the specification as filed. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. On pages 2-3, the Office Action asserts that the phrase “automatic traveling” is unclear, and chooses to interpret the term “automatic traveling” as navigation aid. Based on this incorrect interpretation of the claim language, the Office Action equates the navigation system 205 in Obradovich with the recited “automatic traveling.” Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Office Action incorrectly asserts the phrase “automatic traveling” is indefinite, and incorrectly proposed an interpretation of the term inconsistent with the clear meaning of the term in view of the specification. Page 14 of the specification, for example, repeatedly refers to “automatic traveling such as auto-cruise traveling or lane-keep traveling.” Thus, the specification clearly indicates the meaning of the recited phrase. “An applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer” (MPEP § 2111.01(IV)). Interpretation of the phrase “automatic traveling” consistent with its use on page 14 of the specification does not improperly import limitations from the specification, at least because the Office Action acknowledges, by way of

rejecting the phrase as unclear, that the phrase does not have a plain meaning independent of the specification. Thus, it is proper to refer to the specification to understand the meaning of the term as used in the claims.

Additionally, the interpretation of “automatic traveling” proposed by the Office Action is inconsistent with use of the phrase in the specification, and thus is incorrect. *See* MPEP § 2111.01(I) (“the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification”). This further demonstrates the error in the interpretation proposed by the Office Action. When the claim language is properly interpreted, it is clear that the navigation system 205 in Obradovich does not relate to “automatic traveling such as auto-cruise traveling or lane-keep traveling,” and that Obradovich does not disclose or suggest the recited “automatic traveling.”

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the term “automatic traveling” is not unclear when properly interpreted in its context in the claims and application, and thus requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 11, 19/1 (claim 19 as it depends on claim 1), and 19/11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0036601 (Obradovich). On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 4, 6, 7/6, 10/6, and 19/6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,207 (Oouchi). On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 14/6, 15/6, 16/15/6, 17/15/6, and 18/15/6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich and Oouchi in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0196134 (Lutter). On page 7

of the Office Action, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich and Oouchi in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0210228 (Ebersole). On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 3, 9/8, 10/8, and 19/8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,650 (Nakai). On page 9 of the Office Action, claims 14/8, 15/8, 16/15/8, 17/15/8, and 18/15/8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Nakai and Lutter. On page 10 of the Office Action, claims 12/1 and 12/11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,394,332 (Kuwahara). On page 10 of the Office Action, claims 13/12/1 and 13/12/11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Kuwahara and U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0203951 (Mazzara). On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 14/1, 14/11, 15/1, 15/11, 16/15/1, 16/15/11, 17/15/1, 17/15/11, 18/15/1, and 18/15/11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view Lutter. On page 12 of the Office Action, claim 13/12/6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Oouchi, Kuwahara, and Mazzara. On page 13 of the Office Action, claim 12/8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Nakai and Kuwahara. On page 13 of the Office Action, claim 13/12/8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Nakai, Kuwahara, and Mazzara. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Amended independent claims 1, 6, 8, and 11 each recite, inter alia, “a visual information providing unit to visually display various states of a vehicle, . . . the visual information providing unit comprises a display part and an analog meter to display various states of a vehicle.” Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not render obvious the recite “visual

information providing unit,” with its attendant limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

In addition to the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is further nonobvious over the cited art, as navigation system 205 in Obradovich does not disclose or suggest “automatic traveling,” discussed above. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of independent claim 1 and the claims that depend thereon.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner’s amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicant’s attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eric M. Shelton

Registration No. 57,630

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS/EMS:amz
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: April 6, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**